

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,290	08/01/2003	Aman Gupta	GEMS8081.168	3334
	7590 02/13/2009 I PATENT SOLUTION	EXAMINER ·		
136 S WISCON	NSIN ST	TIMBLIN, ROBERT M		
PORT WASHINGTON, WI 53074			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		2167	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/633,290	GUPTA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert M. Timblin	2167	

		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
·	Robert M. Timblin	2167	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 22 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprially set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	•	TE below);	·
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTOL 224)
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	16	
13. Other:			
	JOH	N COTTINGHAM	
	SUPERVISO	DRY PATENT EXAMINE	À
	TFC HA	OGY CENTER 2100	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues on page 6 that the cited Kennedy '519 and Kennedy '847 references do not regard orders that have shipped. Specifically, it is argued that "automatically determining a shipment quality metric for all orders that have shipped has not been taught or suggested. The Examiner respectfully disagrees because at least Kennedy '847 is concerned with shipped orders. In at least col. 33 lines 42-55 (as noted in the previous office action), Kennedy '847 monitors shipment confirmations. That is, when a shipment is completed (i.e. the orders have been shipped) a status is updated which is used in notification of fulfillment..

The Examiner further submits that the specific quality metric was addressed in the previous Office Action on page 8 by Tucker in respect to claims 23 and similar claim 32.

Further, Applicant traverses the previous 35 USC 101 rejection and states that signals per se are statutory. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner submits that claims that recite nothing but the physical characteristics of a form of energy such as a frequency, voltage, or the strength of a magnetic field, define energy or magnetism, per se, and as such are non statutory natural phenomena. O'Reilly, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 112-14. Generally, a signal is not a process because it is not a series of steps to produce an outcome. A signal per se is not a machine as a machine is defined a mechanical device or combination of mechanical powers and devices to perform some function and produce a certain effect or result. Clearly a signal is not a composition of matter because it is not a composition of two or more substances. Lastly a signal per se is not a manufacture as it is not the production of articles for use from raw or prepared materials by giving to these materials new forms, qualities, properties, or combinations, whether by hand-labor or by machinery. The above definitions require physical substance, which a claimed signal does not have.

The Examiner thanks Applicant for the analogy of signals to iron both occurring in nature but respectfully submits that in such a case, an iron machine component would be a manufacture. That is, it is a production of an article for use from raw materials (i.e. iron) to be given a new form, qualities or properties.